

Case 3669

Family-group names based on *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786 (Aves, CRACIDAE): proposed conservation of either Ortalida-, Ortalis- or Ortalid- as the stem and suppression of family-group names based on *Ortalis* Fallén, 1810 (Insecta, Diptera) in the latter two instances, and acceptance of the English text of part of Article 29.3.3 of the Code as definitive in the second instance

Thomas M. Donegan

ProAves Foundation, Southmead, The Vale, London N14 6HN, U.K.
(e-mail: tdonegan@proaves.org)

Abstract. The Case is brought under Articles 78.1, 81.1 and 89 of the Code to resolve a controversy surrounding the stem of family-group names based on *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786, a genus of large, pheasant-like birds (chachalacas) of the New World. This genus has a junior homonym in Diptera, *Ortalis* Fallén, 1810, and various family-group names based on the dipteran genus were proposed before anyone noticed the homonymy. Despite their invalidity under Article 39 of the Code, these dipteran names remain available names, preoccupying obvious stems for avian family-group names. A new tribe ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012 was proposed for the avian *Ortalis*, its non-standard stem Ortalida- being chosen under Article 29.6 of the Code to avoid homonymy with dipteran names. Subsequently, an attempt was made to emend ORTALIDAINI to ORTALISINI David, 2014, but the emended name is identical in spelling to the available dipteran name ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897. Acceptance of ORTALIDAINI as the valid spelling might be threatened as a result of the differing English and French versions of Article 29.3.3 of the Code concerning family-name stem formation, the French preventing an otherwise valid emendation of this name, but the English not. The Commission is asked to choose between (i) endorsing ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012 as being based on an ‘appropriate’ stem under Article 29.6; or (ii) using its plenary power to suppress ORTALISINI Acloque 1897 in favour of David (2014)’s junior homonym ORTALISINI, giving precedence to the English version of Article 29.3.3 of the Code and deeming David (2014)’s emendation to be valid on different grounds to those stated (i.e. ORTALIDAINI being inappropriate under Article 29.6); or (iii) suppressing all competing family-group names based on *Ortalis* Fallén, 1810 and making the ‘standard’ family-group name ORTALIDINI thereby capable of usage in Aves.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; ORTALIDAINI; ORTALIDINI; ORTALINI; ORTALISINI; chachalacas; ORTALISCIDAE, CEROXYDIDAE; family-group names; stem formation; homonymy; correct original spelling; English-French discrepancy.

1. The genus *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786 (p. 40) was established with the type species *Phasianus motmot* Linnaeus, 1766 (p. 271) by monotypy. It is used today for a group

of New World gallinaceous birds known as chachalacas (CRACIDAE). Merrem's (1786) description reads as follows: 'Quod genus, cum multas sane species comprehendat, in plures phalanges dividendum videtur, quarum primam cum Linnaeo atque Brissonio *Cracem*, eam, ad quam nostra pertinet species, *Penelopen*, tertiam, ad quam *Phasianus Motmot* et similes ei referendae sunt aves, *Ortalida* appello.' [Which genus, as it indeed includes many species, is seen as divided into several groups, of which the first, in agreement with Linnaeus and Brisson, is [*Crax*]; the one to which our species [*Penelope*] pertains; and third, one to which *Phasianus Motmot* and the birds similar to it are referred, that I call [*Ortalis*.] Under Article 11.8.1 of the Code, the correct original spelling of this generic name is the nominative singular form *Ortalis*, not the accusative form *Ortalida* which is required grammatically by the preceding word 'appello' in Merrem's (1786) Latin text. 'Penelopen' (for *Penelope* Merrem, 1786), 'Meleagridem' (for *Meleagris* Linnaeus, 1758) and 'Cracem' (for *Crax* Linnaeus, 1758) appear in the same passage for the same reason. The spelling '*Ortalida*' was, nonetheless, used as valid by ornithologists for almost a century (e.g. by Lesson, 1828 (p. 217); Jardine, 1847 (p. 374); Bonaparte, 1856 (p. 875); Gray, 1867 (pp. 10–13); Sclater & Salvin, 1870 (pp. 505–511, 521, 531–543) and other authors cited by the latter). Gloger (1841, p. 373) used the spelling *Ortalis* without explanation, but after Wharton's (1879) explanation of the need for a correction, use of the spelling *Ortalis* for the chachalacas has been universal.

3. During the c.100 years of usage of the misspelled generic name '*Ortalida*' for chachalacas, *Ortalis* Fallén, 1810 (p. 17) was described in Diptera, with type species *Musca vibrans* Linnaeus, 1758 by subsequent designation of Westwood (1840, p. 149). This genus became the type of a family-group name, which was itself given a multitude of different forms and spellings during the 1800s, including the following relevant to this Case: ORTALIDES Fallén, 1810 (p. 17), ORTALIDAE sensu Swainson, 1840 (p. 378), ORTALIDIDAE sensu Harris, 1841 (p. 416) and ORTALISINI sensu Acloque, 1897 (p. 483). Several other unjustified emendations and misspellings are listed by Sabrosky (1999). Synonymy of the two names *Ortalis* was first noted in entomology by Aldrich (1933, p. 7), whereupon Ghesquière (1947, p. 691) proposed *Ortaliscus* as a replacement name for *Ortalis* Fallén, 1810 and made this the type genus of a new family, ORTALISCIDAE Ghesquière, 1947 (p. 691). Family-group names for this group of flies were discussed by Sabrosky (1946, pp.170–171) who proposed using CEROXYDIDAE for the group.

4. The dipteran 'Fam. Ortalides' was proposed by Fallén (1810, p. 15) in an entirely Latin work. This name is therefore not a French vernacular plural, but a Latin name with a non-standard ending. It was not until later (Strickland et al., 1842) that the convention of ending families with *-idae*, and subfamilies with *-inae*, became more consistently applied and much later when this was mandated. Sabrosky (1999, p. 226) recognised Fallén (1810) as the authority for family-group names based on *Ortalis* Fallén, 1810. Swainson (1840) was apparently the first to adopt a Latinised form acceptable under Articles 29.1, 29.2 and 29.3.1.1 of the Code, viz., ORTALIDAE. This spelling is a justified emendation of ORTALIDES under Articles 33.2.2 and 32.5.3.1 of the Code. Soon after, Harris (1841, p. 15) mentioned Fallén's (1810) original ORTALIDES and introduced a new spelling, ORTALIDIDAE (p. 416). He was apparently not aware of, and did not cite, Swainson's (1840) prior work or spelling. Despite the wide page-gap, Harris (1841) cited both the old and proposed new spellings, so

ORTALIDIDAE is to be regarded as a demonstrably intentional emendation under Article 33.2.1 of the Code. Inasmuch as it involves the correction of a family-level suffix, it is also a justified emendation under Articles 33.2.2 and 32.5.3.1. Like ORTALIDAE, ORTALIDIDAE is to be attributed to Fallén, 1810. Whether ORTALIDAE or ORTALIDIDAE, if either, is the ‘correct original spelling’ depends on three factors: whether the stem is correctly formed (Article 29.3), whether or not the name enjoys prevailing usage (Article 29.5), and whether there are any other competing names (one of which is discussed in the next paragraph). According to Brown (1956, p. 146), ‘ortalis’ is a Greek noun meaning ‘young bird, chick, fowl’, with the genitive form ‘ortalidos’. As a result, the etymologically correct stem for family-group name formation is ‘Ortalid-’.

5. The name ORTALISINI was introduced by Acloque (1897, p. 483) for a group of unspecified rank within the ‘tribus’ that he called Muscii (= MUSCIDAE Latreille, 1802 emend. Kirby & Spence, 1815). ‘*Ortalis* Fallén 1810’ is cited at the end of Acloque’s account (p. 484), so it seems reasonable to regard ORTALISINI as a family-group name for a sub-tribe. It was introduced without reference to previous family-group names or earlier spellings, and it differs from them in using the entire name of the type genus *Ortalis* as the stem to which a suffix is added, as permitted under Article 29.1 of the Code. ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897 is available by indication under Article 12.2.4 if it is an emendation and not a mis-spelling. Acloque (1897) made no statement of intent to change earlier spellings, and he did not cite any previous spellings, so his ORTALISINI is not an emendation under either the first or second criteria listed in Article 33.2.1 of the Code. However, he did form multiple stems for taxa of the same rank as ORTALISINI based, as for *Ortalis*, on the full names of their type genera. Within his ‘Muscii’, examples are SEPEDONINI Acloque, 1897 (p. 481) based on *Sepedon* Latreille, 1804, TEPHRITISINI Acloque, 1897 (p. 484) based on *Tephritis* Latreille, 1804 and SEPSISINI Acloque, 1897 (p. 484) based on *Sepsis* Fallén, 1810. Acloque (1897, p. 33) also formed a family-group name in Odonata as MYRMELEONINI based on *Myrmeleon* Linnaeus, 1767. Sabrosky (1999, pp. 226, 280, 302) regarded SEPEDONINI as a valid family-group name with Acloque’s authorship, but he treated SEPSISINI and TEPHRITISINI as mis-spellings and failed to mention ORTALISINI. Because ‘two or more names in the same work are treated in a similar way’, Acloque (1897)’s family-group names ending -ini based on full genus names are deemed to satisfy the requirement for ‘intentional change’ and are therefore attempted emendations under the third criterion listed in Article 33.2.1 (at least, for instances such as ORTALISINI, in which a change actually resulted). Acloque (1897)’s names are not justified emendations under Articles 33.2.2 and 32.5.3.1, though, because the suffixes are incorrectly formed: -ini is the prescribed suffix for a tribe and -ina for a subtribe (Article 29.2 of the Code) whilst, as noted above, Acloque’s ORTALISINI was proposed at an unstated rank below ‘tribus’ so should better have been spelled using a sub-tribe termination ‘-ina’. However, either as a new name or as an unjustified emendation, ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897 is an available family-group name with its own authorship. Because it has not apparently been used again, except in a reprint (Acloque 2003), ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897 does not threaten prevailing usage of the names discussed in paragraph 4.

6. Donegan (2012, p. 42) proposed a new avian family-group name ORTALIDAINI based on the type genus ‘*Ortalis* (or *Ortalida*) Merrem, 1786’. The stem Ortalida- was

chosen to ‘avoid homonymy with names used in Diptera’ (p. 42), but I did not cite all potentially conflicting names or discuss their availability. The names ORTALIDAE Fallén, 1810 (emend. Swainson, 1840), ORTALIDIDAE Fallén, 1810 (emend. Harris, 1841) and ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897 are here all considered available names whose homonymy requires avoidance under Article 29.6, in the first two instances as independently derived justified emendations the second of which is etymologically correct and in the latter instance as an unjustified emendation with incorrect termination and stem. These three names are all invalid under Article 39 of the Code because their type genus is a junior homonym of *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786, but this does not affect their status as available names either. In Donegan (2012, p. 42), I noted the prior usage of the first two of these and ‘various alternatives for, or misspellings of, those names . . . in the entomological literature (Sabrosky 1999)’. I also stated that the ‘stem for this name would ordinarily be Ortalid-’, but that stem is preoccupied by ORTALIDIDAE Fallén, 1810. Article 29.6 of the Code requires avoidance of homonymy through use of ‘an appropriate stem from the name of the type genus’, but for the chachalacas, de novo use of the entire generic name as the stem, as advised in Recommendation 29A, is not possible due to homonymy with ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897. Article 29.6 does not prescribe a course of action when both the genitive stem of the name and the stem based on the full generic name have both previously been used, but it does allow an ‘appropriate’ stem to be formed. ‘Appropriateness’ of the stem Ortalida- can be considered in the context of: (i) euphony of this combination of letters, which are in the form of a first declension nominative Latin noun in the puella group (Donegan, 2012, p. 43) so comparable to nouns ending –ida (cf. regicida, patricida); and (ii) a nod to taxonomic history, due to coincidence of this stem with the name used for almost a hundred years (albeit incorrectly) for the type genus (Donegan, 2012, pp. 4243). Other potentially ‘appropriate’ stems are also preoccupied, e.g. Ortal- by ORTALIDAE Fallén, 1810 and Ortali- by the coleopteran tribe ORTALIINI Mulsant, 1850 (p. 892). The correct attribution of the latter might better be to Crotch, 1874 (p. 274) because Mulsant (1850) used a vernacular form which is not a ‘name’ under the Code. Pakaluk et al. (1994) and Bouchard et al. (2011) treated Mulsant’s authorship as generally accepted. Neither the date of publication nor authorship of this name have any impact on the present Case.

7. David (2014, p. 99) attempted to emend ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012 to ORTALISINI Donegan, 2012, the original authorship being retained because David (2014) considered this a justified emendation, citing Articles 32.2.2 and 33.2.2 of the Code. David (2014), however, relied on Sabrosky (1999)’s list of family names in Diptera without carrying out further online searches and was therefore unaware of ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897. This makes moot all of David (2014)’s other arguments. It is relevant to this Case, however, that his reasoning centred on a misconception that Donegan (2012) had based ORTALIDAINI on the full original misspelling *Ortalida* of the type genus when the stem Ortalida- was expressly formed under Article 29.6 as an ‘appropriate’ stem to avoid homonymy and continuing usage of *Ortalis* as a genus name was expressly endorsed. It might seem attractive to state that David (2014) contains an unjustified emendation to a junior homonym and leave things at that. Certainly, at present, ORTALIDAINI is the only proposed spelling which can currently be treated as correct under a reasonable interpretation of the Code. However, doing no more than asserting this results in an unstable situation. In particular, the spelling

ORTALIDAINI could potentially be threatened by other emendations on the grounds that other spellings are more 'appropriate', particularly with reference to Articles 29.3.3 and 29.4 of the Code.

8. Under Article 29.4 of the Code, the spelling of a new family-group name such as ORTALIDAINI, with a derivation that 'does not follow the grammatical procedures of Articles 29.3.1 or 29.3.2' (i.e. the 'traditional stem' rules), is to be maintained and cannot be emended if the name has a 'correctly formed suffix' under Article 29.2 of the Code, which this name does, and if it is 'formed from the name of the type genus as though it were an arbitrary combination of letters [Art. 29.3.3]'. Article 29.3.3 sets out rules for formation of stems for names not based in Greek or Latin, so it is not directly relevant to the description of ORTALIDAINI, which is based on the Greek noun ὀρταλῖς (ortalis) and whose validity as a spelling is governed solely by Article 29.6. However, other emendations (for example to the spellings 'ORTALISIINI' or 'ORTALISAINI', neither of which is currently preoccupied or here formally proposed in Aves) could perhaps be attempted in future on the basis that ORTALIDAINI is 'inappropriate' for purposes of Article 29.6 (for example due to relevance of Articles 29.3.3–29.4 by analogy) and hence is an incorrect original spelling under Article 32.4. Assuming that the requirements under Article 32.4 could be considered satisfied for any such emendation, which is not entirely clear, then the validity of the amendment would turn on Article 29.4. To judge whether the last condition of Article 29.4 is met, it is necessary to consider the English and French versions of Article 29.3.3 separately, because they are worded quite differently. The English version states that 'the stem for the purposes of the Code is . . . *either* the entire generic name (see Article 29.6), *or* the entire generic name with the ending elided, *or* the entire generic name with one or more appropriate linking letters incorporated in order to form a more euphonious family-group name' (emphasis added). Application of this provision would allow emendations to ORTALIDAINI (if the latter is not considered based on an 'appropriate' stem) because the stem Ortalida- is formed by *both* an elision (of 's') *and* the addition of linking letters ('da'). Under the French version of the Code, however, ORTALIDAINI would be protected from any future emendation. The opening text of Article 29.3.3 is similar to the English version up to the words 'new family-group taxon'. The French Code then lists two (not three) ways of enacting modifications. The second of these is: 'soit la nom de genre avec sa terminaison élidé, *et* une ou plusieurs lettres de liaison ajoutées . . .' [or it be the generic name with its ending elided, *and* one or more connecting letters added . . .] (emphasis added). The French wording thus requires a combination of *both* elision and the addition of linking letters from the starting point of the full generic name if the latter is modified for euphony, and such a combination describes precisely the process by which ORTALIDAINI can be formed. It seems likely that 'et' in the passage quoted above is a mistranslation for what should have been 'ou': the Preface to the Fourth Edition of the Code (p. XVI) notes that the French version largely represents a translation of a near-final working draft of the English. The text of any other authorised version of the Code will depend on whether the English or French was used as the basis for translation; at least the authorised Russian and Japanese editions reflect the English text in this respect.

9. Subsequent to Donegan (2012) the chachalacas have been recognised taxonomically at the family-group level by various authors (Del Hoyo et al., 2014; McMullan & Donegan, 2014), one of which (Remsen et al., 2014) has postponed changing its

treatment while this Case progresses. Ornithological and linguistic authorities specialising with Aves and the Research Coordinating Committee on Avian Nomenclature (RCCAN) have been consulted concerning other possible solutions to this situation. In the absence of any consensus among reviewers of this Case and leading ornithological nomenclature experts as to how it should be handled, it appears that only the Commission has the ability to resolve it definitively.

10. There are three options here presented. The main purpose of this Case is to resolve this controversy and stabilise nomenclature. Given what could be considered a personal conflict as author of one of these name spellings, I will not express any preference:

(a) Option 1 would be to endorse *ORTALIDAINI* Donegan, 2012 as a correct original spelling. The name has had two instances of usage of which I am aware, largely originating with the author (McMullan & Donegan, 2014, Donegan in Remsen, et al., 2014). In favour of this approach, homonymy with previously used names has already been avoided in the original description and no suppression or choice between different language versions of the Code is necessary to adopt this approach. *ORTALIDAINI* was the originally published name, so a decision to conserve it might also promote stability and ease of usage and reference.

(b) Option 2 would be to conserve *ORTALISINI* Donegan, 2012 emend. David, 2014, which has one instance of usage of which I am aware, in the form *ORTALISINAE* (Del Hoyo et al., 2014). This would require suppression of *ORTALISINI* Acloque, 1897, which has no material modern usage. The language discrepancy in Article 29.3.3 also requires addressing under Option 2, since the issue of whether the original spelling *ORTALIDAINI* is capable of being emended at all, and thus whether David's (2014) proposed replacement *ORTALISINI* can be treated as a justified emendation (even with its rationale recast), depends on this. Under Option 2, the original spelling *ORTALIDAINI* would be deemed not to have been based upon an 'appropriate' stem for purposes of Article 29.6 and David (2014)'s emendation would be deemed recast as being valid on that basis, despite the rationale presented therein. Option 2 would promote greater universality in formation of family-group names than Option 1 and involves fewer suppressions than Option 3. However, this requires a view to be taken on the primacy of different language versions of the Code, an issue which may have repercussions for other names even if the French edition is mis-translated. An obvious secondary impact would be for family group names based on genera or with endings which look Latin or Greek but actually have a different etymology. An example is the current controversy between the spellings *TACHURIDIDAE* Ohlson, Irestedt, Ericson & Fjeldså, 2013 (which is valid under the French version of Articles 29.3.3 and 29.4 of the Code) and *TACHURISIDAE* Ohlson, Irestedt, Ericson & Fjeldså, 2013 emend. Franz, 2015 (which is valid under the English version of Articles 29.3.3 and 29.4 of the Code) for names based on *Tachuris* Lafresnaye, 1836 (formerly, *TYRANNIDAE*: Aves). It is unclear as a matter of principle that names based on what looks like a traditional stem should be invalidated, although this is what the English language version of the Code provides. It may therefore be better to consider issues arising from conflicts between these different versions of the Code, and an appropriate resolution to them, only following a detailed review of potential impacts on other family-group names for animals. For completeness, a further sub-option B within Option 2 allows precedence to the English version of Article 29.3.3 to

be afforded only in this particular case, which would avoid other possible disruptions.

(c) Option 3 resolves the situation by suppressing all conflicting and invalid but available names based on *Ortalis* Fallén, 1810 (namely ORTALIDIDAE Fallén, 1810, ORTALIDAE Fallén, 1810 and ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897). This avoids the need to address conflicts between the French and English versions of the Code and results in the chachalacas having a standard stem which is easy to remember for users and more acceptable to classical linguists. Donegan (2012)'s reliance upon an unusual appropriate stem under Article 29.6 and David (2014)'s usage of the full genus name would both thereby be made retroactively unnecessary, making Ortalid- the correct stem and ORTALIDINI the correct name under Articles 29.1 and 29.3.1.

10. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

Option 1

- (1) to use its plenary power to rule that the family-group name ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012 is available with this spelling and authorship, as a result of it being formed based on an 'appropriate' stem for purposes of Article 29.6 of the Code notwithstanding, to the extent this is relevant to 'appropriateness' of the stem Ortalida-, its nonconformity with the specifications of Article 29.3.3 of the English edition of the Code in the event that an otherwise valid emendation were to be attempted to be made thereto;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786 (gender: feminine), type species *Phasianus motmot* Linnaeus, 1766, by monotypy, the type genus of ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012;
- (3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *motmot* Linnaeus, 1766, published in the binomen *Phasianus motmot* (the type species of *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786);
- (4) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology the name ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012, with the endorsement that it is available with this spelling and authorship as ruled in (1) above;
- (5) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology the name ORTALISINI David, 2014, deemed an unjustified emendation of ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012.

Option 2:

- (1) to use its plenary power to rule that the family-group name ORTALISINI Donegan, 2012, a justified emendation by David (2014) of ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012, is available with this spelling and authorship, notwithstanding its homonymy (rendered irrelevant as a result of ruling (2) below) with ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897 and, notwithstanding the rationale presented by David (2014), on the basis that ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012 is an incorrect original spelling not formed based on an 'appropriate' stem for purposes of Article 29.6;
- (2) to suppress for all nomenclatural purposes the family-group name ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897;
- (3) to rule under Article 89 that Article 29.3.3, line 6, of the French edition of the Fourth Edition of the Code should read 'ou' not 'et' and that the

corresponding text in the English edition (also found in other official language editions of the Code, to the extent this English text is translated faithfully in them) shall be deemed definitive:

- (a) generally, henceforth;
- (b) only in relation to the present case;
- (4) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786 (gender: feminine), type species *Phasianus motmot* Linnaeus, 1766, by monotypy, the type genus of ORTALISINI Donegan, 2012;
- (5) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *motmot* Linnaeus, 1766, as published in the binomen *Phasianus motmot* (the type species of *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786);
- (6) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology the name ORTALISINI Donegan, 2012, a justified emendation by David (2014) of ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012, with the endorsements that it is available with this spelling and authorship as ruled in (1) above and that it is not to be deemed a junior homonym of ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897, the latter having been suppressed in (2) above;
- (7) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology the following names:
 - (a) ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012, an incorrect original spelling (not having been formed based on an ‘appropriate’ stem under Article 29.6 of the Code) of ORTALISINI Donegan, 2012;
 - (b) ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897, as suppressed in (2) above.

Option 3:

- (1) to use its plenary power to rule that the family-group name ORTALIDINI Donegan, 2012, is available with this spelling and authorship, notwithstanding its homonymy (rendered irrelevant as a result of ruling (2) below) with ORTALIDIDAE Fallén, 1810;
- (2) to suppress the following family-group names for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and Principle of Homonymy:
 - (a) ORTALIDIDAE Fallén, 1810;
 - (b) ORTALIDAE Fallén, 1810;
 - (c) ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897;
- (3) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786 (gender: feminine), type species *Phasianus motmot* Linnaeus, 1766 by monotypy, the type genus of ORTALIDINI Donegan, 2012;
- (4) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *motmot* Linnaeus, 1766, as published in the binomen *Phasianus motmot* (the type species of *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786);
- (5) to place on the Official List of Family-Group names in Zoology the name ORTALIDINI Donegan, 2012, with the endorsements that it is available with this spelling and authorship as ruled in (1) above and that it is not to be deemed a junior homonym of ORTALIDIDAE Fallén, 1810, the latter having been suppressed in (2) above; and
- (6) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology the following names:

- (a) ORTALIDAINI Donegan, 2012, an incorrect original spelling (under Articles 29.1 and 29.3.1 of the Code, as a result of the suppressions of names in (2) above) of ORTALIDINI Donegan, 2012;
- (b) ORTALIDIDAE Fallén, 1810, as suppressed in (2) above;
- (c) ORTALIDAE Fallén, 1810, as suppressed in (2) above;
- (d) ORTALISINI Acloque, 1897, as suppressed in (2) above;
- (e) ORTALISINI David, 2014, deemed an unjustified emendation (under Articles 29.1 and 29.3.1 of the Code, as a result of the suppressions of names in (2) above) of ORTALIDINI Donegan, 2012.

Acknowledgements

This case benefitted from several helpful discussions with and constructive comments of Richard Schodde, Laurent Raty, Neal Evenhuis, Edward Dickinson, one other person and four anonymous ICZN Commissioners.

References

- Acloque, A.** 1897. *Faune de France contenant la description des espèces indigènes disposées en tableaux analytiques et illustrée de figures représentant les types caractéristiques des genres. Orthoptères, névroptères, hyménoptères, lépidoptères, hémiptères, diptères, aphaniptères, thysanoptères, rhipiptères avec 1235 figures.* viii, 516 pp. Librairie J.-B. Baillière et Fils, Paris.
- Acloque, A.** 2013. *Faune de France.* viii, 516 pp. Forgotten Books, London.
- Aldrich, J.M.** 1933. New Diptera, or two-winged flies, from America, Asia, and Java, with additional notes. *Proceedings of the U.S. National Museum*, **81**: 1–28
- Bonaparte, C.L.J.L.** 1856. Tableaux paralléliques de V ordre des Gallinacés. *Compte Rendus Hebdomadaire des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences*, **42**: 874–884.
- Bouchard, P., Bousquet, Y., Davies, A.E., Alonso-Zaragaza, M.A., Lawrence, J.F., Lyal, C.H.C., Newton, A.F., Reid, C.A.M., Schmitt, M., Slipinski, A. & Smith, A.B.T.** 2011. Family-group names in Coleoptera (Insecta). *ZooKeys*, **88**: 1–972.
- Brown, R.W.** 1956. *Composition of scientific words.* 882 pp. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington & London.
- Crotch, G.R.** 1874. *A revision of the coleopterous family Coccinellidae.* xv, 311 pp. E.W. Janson, London.
- David, N.** 2014. The correct stems of family-group names citing *Ortalis* Merrem, 1786, as type genus (Aves: Cracidae). *Zootaxa*, **3795**: 99–100.
- Del Hoyo, J., Collar, N.J., Christie, D.A., Elliott, A. & Fishpool, L.D.C.** 2014. *Illustrated checklist of the birds of the world.* vol. 1 (non-passerines). 904 pp. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona & BirdLife International, Cambridge.
- Donegan, T.M.** 2012. A new group name for the chachalacas (Aves: Cracidae: *Ortalis*). *Conservación Colombiana*, **17**: 41–44.
- Fallén, C.F.** 1810. *Specim. entomolog. novam Diptera disponendi methodum exhibens.* 26 pp. Berlingianis, Lund.
- Ghesquière, J.** 1947. P. 691 in Lepesme, P., *Les insectes des palmiers.* iv, 903 pp. Le Chevalier, Paris.
- Gloger, C.W.L.** 1841. *Gemeinnütziges Hand- und Hilfsbuch der Naturgeschichte.* Part 5. A. 496 pp. Schulz & Comp., Breslau.
- Gray, G.R.** 1867 *List of the specimens of birds in the collection of the British Museum. Part V. Gallinae.* 120 pp. Trustees of the British Museum, London.
- Harris, T.W.** 1841 *A report on insects of Massachusetts, injurious to vegetation.* 1st edition. viii, 459 pp. Folsom, Wells & Thurston, Cambridge, MA.
- Jardine, W.** 1847. Birds of Tobago. *Annals and Magazine of Natural History including Zoology, Botany and Geology*, **20**: 370–8.

- Lesson, R.P.** 1828. *Manuel d'ornithologie, ou description des genres et des principales espèces d'oiseaux*, vol. 2. 448 pp. Roret Libraire, Paris.
- McMullan, M. & Donegan, T.M.** 2014. *Field guide to the birds of Colombia 2nd edition*. 396 pp. Fundación ProAves, Bogotá.
- Merrem, B.** 1786. *Avium rariorum et minus cognitarum icones et descriptiones collectæ et e Germanicis Latinæ factæ*. 45 pp. J.G. Müller, Leipzig.
- Mulsant, É.** 1850. Species des Coléoptères trimères sécuripalpes. *Annales des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles et d'Industrie (Lyon)*, **1/2**: 1–1104. C. Savy Jeune, Paris.
- Pakaluk, J., Ślipiński, S.A., Lawrence, J.F.** 1994. Current classification and family-group names in Cucujoidea (Coleoptera). *Genus*, **5**: 223–268.
- Remsen, J.V., Cadena, C.D., Jaramillo, A., Nores, M., Pacheco, J. F., Pérez-Éman, J., Robbins, M.B., Stiles F.G., Stotz, D.F. & Zimmer, K.J.** 2014. *A classification of the bird species of South America (version 26 August 2014)*. URL: www.museum.lsu.edu/~Remsen/SACCBaseline.html
- Sabrosky, C.W.** 1946. Family names in the order Diptera. *Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington*, **48**: 163–171
- Sabrosky, C.W.** 1999 Family-group names in Diptera. Pp. 1–360 in Thompson, F.C. (Ed.), *Family-group names in Diptera and bibliography*. 576 pp. North American Dipterists' Society & Backhuys Publishers, Leiden (*Miya*, vol. 10).
- Sclater, P.L. & Salvin, O.** 1870. Synopsis of the Cracidae. *Proceedings of the Scientific Meetings of the Zoological Society of London for the year 1870*, **1870**: 504–543.
- Strickland, H.E., Phillips, J., Richardson, J., Owen, R., Jenyns, L., Broderip, W.J., Henslow, J.S., Shuckard, W.E., Waterhouse, G.R., Yarrell, W., Darwin, C. & Westwood, J.O.** 1842. Series of propositions for rendering the nomenclature of zoology uniform and permanent, being the report of a committee for the consideration of the subject appointed by the British Association for the Advancement of Science. *The Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Zoology, Botany and Geology being a continuation of the Annals combined with Loudon and Charlesworth's Magazine of Natural History*, **11**: 259–275.
- Swainson, W.** 1840 Diptera. Pp. 366–380 in Swainson, W. & Shuckard, W.E. (Eds.), *On the history and natural arrangement of insects*. Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopaedia. 406 pp. London.
- Westwood, J. O.** 1840. Order XIII. Diptera Aristotle. (Antliata Fabricius. Halteriptera Clairv.) *Synopsis of the genera of British insects*. Pp. 125–154 in: *An introduction to the modern classification of insects; founded on the natural habits and corresponding organisation of the different families*. 587 pp. Longman, Orme, Brow, Green & Longmans, London.
- Wharton, H.T.** 1879. On the orthography of some birds' names. *Ibis*, **4**(3): 449–454.

Acknowledgement of receipt of this application was published in BZN **71**: 146.

Comments on this case are invited for publication (subject to editing) in the *Bulletin*; they should be sent to the I.C.Z.N., c/o Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e-mail: iczn@nhm.ac.uk).